

Remarks

It is observed that the Examiner rejected claims 24, 27-39, 43 and 46 as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Helmsderfer (US 6,028,627), and claims 40-42 as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Helmsderfer, and further in view of Tandler.

According to the Examiner, Zhang discloses all of the features of applicant's claim 24 but the following features:

- the connecting element is rigid;
- the bridge-like structure mutually connects elements for coupling to the front adapter;
- the elements for coupling are arranged on opposite ends of the bridge-like structure;
- the bridge-like element extends from left to right, transversely with respect to said front adapter;
- the elements for coupling are arranged at left and right ends of the bridge-like element;
- the bridge-like element protrudes from the front adapter so as to space the display means in front of the eyes of a person that wears the helmet;
- the display means are rotatable upward to be placed substantially in line with the front adapter.

The Examiner is of the opinion that all the above features can be found in Helmsderfer and that therefore the skilled person in the art would have combined in an obvious manner Zhang with Helmsderfer.

The applicant respectfully strongly disagrees to the interpretation of the new prior art document.

The applicant agrees with the Examiner that all the above listed features are not disclosed by Zhang, but at the same time maintains that at least the feature according to which the display means are rotatable upward to be placed substantially in line with the front adapter is neither disclosed nor even suggested by Helmsderfer.

Therefore, the combination of Zhang with Helmsderfer would not lead the skilled person in the art to a helmet as defined in present claim 24.

Although present independent claim 24 is believed to be already unobvious over the combination of Zhang with Helmsderfer, the applicant has further amended claim 24 in order to clarify that the display means are rotatable upward to be placed in line with the front adapter, so as to pass from an operative position wherein the display means are arranged in front of the eyes of the person who wears the helmet to an inoperative position wherein the display means are arranged in line with the front adapter and out of the line of sight of the person that wears the helmet.

Therefore, the new claim 24 recites as follows:

A helmet for displaying environmental images in critical environments, comprising at least one video camera and means for displaying environmental images, further comprising a supporting structure that can be anchored to said helmet in order to support said at least one video camera and said display means, said supporting structure comprising a front adapter that can be coupled to a front edge of said helmet, a rear adapter that can be coupled to a rear edge of said helmet, and a rigid connecting element for mutually connecting said front adapter and said rear adapter, further comprising a frame that is mounted detachably on said front adapter, said frame comprising means for supporting said video camera and means for supporting said display means, wherein said frame comprises a bridge-like structure that mutually connects elements for coupling to said front adapter, said elements for coupling being arranged on opposite ends of said bridge-like structure, said bridge-like element extending from left to right, transversely with respect to said front adapter, said elements for coupling being arranged at left and right ends of said bridge-like element, said bridge-like element protruding from the front adapter so as to space said display means in front of the eyes of a person that wears said helmet, said display means being rotatable upward to be placed substantially in line with said front adapter, so as to pass from an operative position wherein the display means are arranged in front of the eyes of the person that wears the helmet to an inoperative position wherein the display means are arranged in line with the front

adaptee and out of the line of sight of the person that wears the helmet.

Even the Examiner did not indicate that Helmsderfer discloses the feature of the upwardly rotatable display means and thus even the combination of Zhang with Helmsderfer could lead the skilled person to a helmet as claimed in claim 24.

In addition, it is observed that undoubtedly the LCD of Zhang is fixed, not rotatable upward. Helmsderfer does not even disclose the presence of an LCD, thus the combination of the two references would not lead the skilled person to the helmet claimed in applicant's claim 24.

Therefore, in view of the above, the applicant strongly maintains that amended claim 24 is both new and unobvious over the cited prior art documents.

The application is believed to be in order for acceptance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

However, the applicant is open to any suggestion the Examiner may have to improve the wording of the claims-

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel O'Byrne (Reg. No. 36,625)

Agent for the Applicant

Date: May 30, 2011
Address: Via Meravigli 16, 20123 MILAN-ITALY
Telephone: (from USA) (011)(39)(02)8590-7777
Telefax: (from USA)(011)(39)(02)863-860